



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,255	10/30/2000	Kenzou Sekiguchi	35.G2225 Div. I	3858

5514 7590 10/08/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

16

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PRG

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/698,255

Applicant(s)

SEKIGUCHI, KENZOU

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: 

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Request for Consideration filed on 7/17/2003 (paper #15). Claims 29-46 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 29-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morikawa US pat. No.5,765,170 in view of Nielsen US pat. No.6,453,327.

As to claims 29 and 46, Morikawa discloses a communication device comprising:

reception means (Mailbox Manager 2 of fig. 1) for sending a transmit request to an email server receiving an email transmitted from the email server in response to the transmit request (i.e., upon receipt of a request for transferring from the data processing system 4 of fig. 1, see figs.1, 2, abstract, col.3 line 14 to col.4 line 56 and col.5 line 57 to col.6.line 49).

acquisition means (FO fig. 1) for acquiring size information of an e-mail, stored in the e-mail server (i.e., storing data in folders before sending to the server 6 of fig. 1 through data processing systems 3 and 4 of fig.6), from the e-mail server before sending the transmit request to the email server (see col.3 lines 14-64 and col.5 line 56 to col.7 line 37).

memory for storing e-mails received by said reception means (see fig. 1, storing in dedicate folders F1, F2, F3 of fig.1).

a judgment means for judging (i.e., controlling classified data information) whether it is possible or not to receive at said communication device an a mail stored in the e-mail server, according to the size information and a storable capacity of said memory (i.e., sending information and the length of mail M and storing as the directory data, see fig. 1 and 2, col.2 line 34 to col.3 line 55, col.6 line 2 to col.7 line 37 and col.8 lines 15-67). Morikawa does not specifically disclose a warning means for visually outputting warning information.

However, Nielsen discloses a warning means for visually outputting warning information (i.e., using Trusted Group Server to issue email containing X-Junk-Mail-Warning, col.7 lines 63-66) indicating that an e-mail to said communication device, stored in said e-mail server, cannot be received, as a result of said judgment, when said judgment means makes such judgment (i.e., indicated by arrows, upon receipt of the Junk Mail Warning message, the email system for each Trusted Group Server removes the putative junk message, see abstract, fig.1, 3, col.6 lines 53-67, col.7 line 21 to col.8 line 42 and col.10 lines 15-67). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to utilize Nielsen's filter into the computer system of Morikawa to prevent unwanted data because it would have reduced the exposure of junk email messages received to the group of trusted users.

As to claim 30, Morikawa discloses size information contains the size of data when an e-mail received from said e-mail server contains various kinds of data (see col.1 line 46 to col.2 line 26 and col.8 lines 15-67). Morikawa does not specifically disclose data is an image data. However, Morikawa discloses creating a plurality of folders for storing data associated with electronic mail including many types of data. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize different type of data including image data depending on the choice of implementation, and still achieve the same results.

As to claim 31, Nielsen further discloses a recording means, wherein said output means generates a report indicating said warning information and records it using said recording means (see fig.3, 4, col.1 line 48 to col.2 line 48, col.6 line 52 to col.8 line 65). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Nielsen's teachings into the system of Morikawa to prevent unwanted data because it would have reduced the amount of unwanted data received by a user of the email system.

As to claim 32, Morikawa discloses converting a received e-mail into image data and records that e-mail using said recording means (i.e., converting data using different types of data, see col.4 lines 5-56 and col.8 line 15 to col.9 line 9).

As to claim 33, Morikawa discloses when a plurality of e-mails are stored in an e-mail server, a communication device executes reception of emails from said e-mail server in a predetermined order, until said judgment means judges that it is impossible to receive an e-mail (see col.2 line 29 to col.3 line 14, col.6 line 33 to col.7 line 58).

Claims 34-38 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 29-33 respectively.

Claims 39-43 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 29-33 respectively.

As to claims 44 and 45, Morikawa discloses delete request means for requesting deletion of an email stored in the email server based upon a judgment (see figs.4, 6, col.8 line 15 to col.9 line 45).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/17/2003 (paper #15) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

* Applicant asserts that the Morikawa reference does not disclose judging whether it is possible to receive email based on the size of the email and a storage capacity of a memory.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Morikawa discloses creating email (using the electronic mail facility) based on the size (length) of the email and the attachments AF as attribute information (see fig.2, col.6 line 33 to col.7 line 63) and specifying specific folders suitable for storing attachment data (see col.8 lines 15-67).

* Applicant asserts that the Nielsen reference does not disclose the warning means.

Examiner points out that Nielsen clearly discloses a warning means for visually outputting warning information (i.e., using Trusted Group Server to issue email containing X-Junk-Mail-Warning, col.7 lines 63-66) indicating that an e-mail to said communication device, stored in said e-mail server, cannot be received, as a result of said judgment, when said judgment means makes such judgment (i.e., indicated by arrows, upon receipt of the Junk Mail Warning message, the email system for each Trusted Group Server removes the putative junk message, see abstract, fig.1, 3, col.6 lines 53-67, col.7 line 21 to col.8 line 42 and col.10 lines 15-67) as rejected above.

Therefore, the rejection is respectfully maintained.

Conclusion

5. Claims 29-46 are *rejected*.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam Hosain, can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The Official fax phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/698,255
Art Unit: 2155

Page 8

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.

Khanh Dinh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2155
10/2/2003


FRANTZ B. JEAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER